	Case 3:12-cv-04604-NC Docum	nent 8	Filed 09/19/12	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
11	SOTELO,		Case No. 12-cv-	-04604 NC	
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASES SHOULD NOT BE CONSOLIDATED		
13	v.				
14	REO CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND		Re: 12-cv-0460	4 NC, Dkt. No. 1 and	
15	ASSET MANAGEMENT, INC.,		12-cv-04665 NC, Dkt. No. 1		
16	Defendant.				
17	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42 allows a court to consolidate actions before it				
18					
19	that involve a common question of law or fact. This action, <i>Sotelo v. REO Capital</i>				
20	Investment and Asset Management, Inc., 12-cv-04604 NC, was filed on August 31, 2012. A second action, REO Capital Investment and Asset Management, Inc. v. Sotelo, 12-cv-				
21					
22	04665 NC, was removed to this Court from state court on September 6, 2012. On				
23	September 7, 2012, this Court ordered Julia Mary Sotelo, plaintiff in case number 12-cv-				
24	04604 NC, to show cause by October 5, 2012 why case number 12-cv-04604 NC should				
25	not be dismissed for improper venue. 12-cv-04604 NC, Dkt. No. 4. On September 12,				
26	2012, REO, plaintiff in case number 12-cv-04665 NC, moved to remand case number 12-				
27	cv-04665 NC to state court. 12-cv-04665 NC, Dkt. No. 4.				
28					
_0	Case No. 12-cv-04604 NC ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE CONSOLIDATION				

Case 3:12-cv-04604-NC Document 8 Filed 09/19/12 Page 2 of 2

Both of these cases are assigned to me. Both cases arise from the sale of real
property in Tracy, California and involve the adequacy of the notice to quit given to the
occupants of the property and the legality of the occupants' continued possession. These
actions involve a common question of law or fact. Furthermore, both cases present
jurisdictional issues, which are causing duplicative motions and orders. Accordingly, the
parties must show cause by October 5, 2012 why these two cases, 12-cv-04604 NC and 12-
cv-04665 NC, should not be consolidated.
In addition, this Court may not conduct proceedings or enter judgment in a case
without consent of the parties 29 H.C.C. 626(a). Level Dule 72 1(a)(2) requires parties to

In addition, this Court may not conduct proceedings or enter judgment in a case without consent of the parties. 28 U.S.C. 636(c). Local Rule 73-1(a)(2) requires parties to consent or decline within seven days after filing a motion. Therefore, the parties must either file written consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge or request reassignment to a district judge.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 19, 2012

Nathanael M. Cousins

United States Magistrate Judge